DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 818 JC 730 155

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Morrison, James L.; Ferrante, Reynolds |
| TITLE | Compensatory Education in Two-Year Colleges. Report No. 21. |
| INSTITUTION | Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education. |
| PUB DATE | Apr 73 |
| NOTE | 60p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Make inquiries to Center for the Study of Higher Education, 101 Rackley Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | College Role; *Community Colleges; *Compensatory Education; Compensatory Education Programs; Counseling Services; *Disadvantaged Groups; *Junior Colleges; *Minority Groups; Recruitment; Surveys; Technical Reports |

ABSTRACT

The public two-year college in its exemplary (comprehensive) form is an open admissions institution characterized by diverse curricular offerings, with a heavy emphasis on guidance and counseling, as well as an emphasis on compensatory and continuing education. The major focus of this study was to examine, by a survey of community colleges, the nature and extent to which compensatory practices and programs exist in two-year colleges for the minority group academically disadvantaged. Subject to normal research limitations, conclusions may be considered as representative of all two-year colleges in this country. Almost all have personal, academic, vocational-occupational, and job placement counseling. Only 40% have the curricular offerings and admissions policies expected of public community colleges. Although almost all public two-year colleges state that they have an open admissions policy, almost 45% require more than a high school diploma or some minimum age standard. It appears that public two-year colleges need additional emphasis on recruitment teams to go into the ghettos. Since only 17% have courses in ethnic studies, more is needed in this area. One-fifth of the private two-year colleges have special programs for the academically disadvantaged, and 2/3 have developed special courses for them. Approximately 40% of the public two-year colleges have special programs for the disadvantaged, a dramatic increase over the past decade but still inadequate in view of the purpose of the community college. (Author/KM)

ED 078818

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# Compensatory Education in Two-Year Colleges

James L. Morrison and Reynolds Ferrante

JC 730 155

Center for the Study of Higher Education
Report No. 21

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

April 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS


LIST OF TABLES v

INTRODUCTION 1

I. Social Mobility 2

A. Open vs. Closed Societies 2
B. Sponsored vs. Contest Mobility 3
C. The Comprehensive Community College as an Agent of Social Mobility 5

II. Current Compensatory Practices and Programs in Higher Education as Described in the Literature 6

A. Compensatory Education Entry Practices 6

1. Modified Recruitment 6
2. Modified Financial Aid 7

B. Compensatory Education for Institutional Success 7

1. Instruction in Basic Communication Skills 7
2. English as a Second Language 8
3. Tutorial Programs 8
4. Flexible Evaluation 9
5. Extended School Experience 9
6. Summer Sessions 10
7. Cultural Enrichment 11
8. Black Studies 11
9. Special Instructional Practices 12
10. Guidance and Counseling 13

C. Federally Sponsored Programs (USOE) 13

D. AACJC Policy Statement on Programs for the Culturally Different in Two-Year Colleges 15

1. Policy Direction 15

E. Examples of Compensatory Programs in Two-Year Colleges 15

1. Cuyahoga Community College 15
2. Project Focus 16
3. Florida Community Colleges 16
4. Inner-City Project of Peralta 17

F. Summary 17

III. Survey Results 17

A. Methodological Considerations 17

1. Research Design 17
2. Data Analysis 18

B. Data Analysis 18

1. Admissions Policies 18
2. Counseling Services 19
3. Curricular Offerings 19
4. Special Programs, Courses, or Services for the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged 19
5. Characteristics of Programs and Services for the Academically Disadvantaged 20

a. Recruitment 20
b. Guidance, Counseling, and Instructional Services 20
c. Financial Aid 21
d. Training Programs for Faculty 22

IV. Summary, Conclusions and Implications 22

TABLES 25

APPENDIX A 35

APPENDIX B 41

BIBLIOGRAPHY 49

## LIST OF TABLES


| | |
|---|---|
| TABLE 1. | Sample Stratification Cells and Weights for Public and Private Two Year Colleges |
| TABLE 2. | Stated Open Admissions for In-District, Out of District, and Out of State Students in Two-Year Colleges |
| TABLE 3. | Admissions Criteria for Two-Year Colleges |
| TABLE 4. | Counseling Services at Two-Year Colleges |
| TABLE 5. | Curricular Offerings in Two-Year Schools |
| TABLE 6. | Percentage of Public and Nonpublic Two-Year Colleges With Special Programs, Courses or Services for the Academically Disadvantaged |
| TABLE 7. | Special Recruitment Services for the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges |
| TABLE 8. | Special Guidance and Counseling for the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges |
| TABLE 9. | Instructional Services for the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges |
| TABLE 10. | Nature and Extent of Federally Funded Financial Aid to Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges |
| TABLE 11. | Nature and Extent of State Funded Financial Aid to Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges |
| TABLE 12. | Nature and Extent of Institutional Financial Aid to the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges |
| TABLE 13. | Nature and Extent of Privately Funded Aid to the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges |

## Introduction*

Within the past few years there have been increasing signs of social instability in American society. During the last decade more than 370 civil rights demonstrations involving over a million participants occurred in our country. Almost every major city in the United States experienced widespread and costly riots and civil disorders. The President's Commission on Violence reported that, in addition to the major riots in such cities as Newark, Watts, and Chicago, there have been over 239 violent urban outbursts involving over 200,000 participants. These outbursts have resulted in the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in property damage alone.[1]

What is the cause of these signs of social instability? Some scholars maintain that these disturbances have resulted from the frustrations and grievances of a large segment of the population (predominantly composed of minority groups) who feel that they lack legitimate access to the rewards and wealth of our society.[2] In short, these groups may have reacted because they believe they have been denied equality of opportunity in civil rights, jobs, or education.

It is the major thesis of this report that, given American norms of contest mobility and the American ideal of equality of opportunity, there is an increasing awareness among particular segments of the lower socio-economic strata of our society that they have not had the same opportunity to compete in the contest for upward mobility as their fellow Americans. They feel that they have not been dealt with legitimately; they believe that they are "disadvantaged." Such awareness has apparently accentuated the frustration of these groups and has thereby led to actions (e.g., civil disturbances) which have threatened the stability of the established social order.

These disturbances, in turn, have stimulated compensatory education from educational institutions. This movement is especially strong in the two-year public community college as this institution operationalizes the "open class" concept in higher education.

The major purposes of this paper are to explain the American norm of contest mobility and relate it to the concept of the comprehensive public two-year community college as the exemplary form of community college education.[3] This concept of the comprehensive community college will provide a comparative base by which we can then evaluate current programs of compensatory education as discussed in the literature. It will also provide a comparative base by which we can evaluate the current practices of the community colleges participating in our investigation.

---

[1]National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, *Progress Report,* (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

[2]See, for example, the work of Robert K. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure* (New York: Glencoe Free Press, 1957), pp. 131-94.

[3]The thesis of this investigation deals primarily with publicly supported two-year colleges. However, an argument could be developed that privately supported two-year colleges also bear some responsibility for societal maintenance although their obligations in this realm are not as extensive as public institutions. For this reason, they are included in this study.

*Partial support for this project was provided by the U.S. Office of Education [Contract No. OEC-0-70-4283 (399)] to the Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

## I. Social Mobility

### A. Open vs. Closed Societies

Theoretically, there are two ideal types of societies: an open society and a closed society. A closed society is one wherein mobility is blocked by ascriptive criteria, e.g., family, sex, religion, or race. In this society, one's position in life is preordained usually by limitation on the kinds of occupations allowed particular members of the society. In traditional India, for example, castes consisted of specific occupational trades because the norms of the caste specified that a person follow in his father's occupational and social footsteps. Further, the norms of the society dictated that marriage follow caste lines, thereby blocking that avenue of mobility.

An open society, on the other hand, is one wherein mobility is characterized by achievement. In this society, various social groupings within the social structure are called social classes. As with castes in closed societies, social classes in open societies seem to center around particular occupational groupings which "hang together," usually by virtue of similar occupational tasks, by the amount of training necessary to accomplish those tasks, by the importance of those tasks to the maintenance of society, and/or by commensurate rewards given by the society for the fulfillment of those tasks. Members of social classes (occupational groupings) have common attitudes and values which may serve to distinguish them from members of other occupational groupings requiring different training skills or experiences. For example, corporation lawyers, managers, physicians, and professionals in general seem to have different perspectives of life and different lifestyles than people who drive trucks, deliver the mail, or perform manual work in factories. These differences in attitudes and values extend to various life areas including political beliefs, religious attitudes, and child-rearing practices.

An explanation for these differences may be that the attitudes and values in question are a response to different conditions of life in different groups. For example, when a family is primarily concerned with obtaining sufficient food, clothing, and shelter, it is unlikely that they will develop such attitudes as deferred gratification or an instrumental orientation toward success. Instead, they will more likely stress immediate gratification (getting all you can while you can), and will define success in terms of luck or survival.

This is in marked contrast to the norms of the higher strata, which generally incorporate attitudes of deferred gratification and an instrumental attitude towards life (e.g., using formal education to obtain the credentials for those occupational positions which bring greater material rewards). In the higher strata, a strong achievement orientation is emphasized. Such values and attitudes are essential for success in securing the training required for higher occupational positions which bring power, privilege, and resources. This power, privilege, and share of resources create an allegiance of the clan to the existing social order. But for those members of the lower strata who must share a smaller portion of the power, privileges, and resources, allegiance to the social order is potentially a problem.

Sociologists are in general agreement that the essential element in obtaining allegiance to a social order is that of legitimacy. In other words, as long as members of a society perceive that their positions in that society are legitimate positions, they will be more likely to have allegiance to the social order of that society and, correspondingly, will be less likely to engage in revolutionary activity to realign that social order.

Norms *vis-a-vis* the legitimacy of social class, power, privilege and mobility vary within different societies. As noted earlier, in traditional Indian society "untouchables" would consider it legitimate, and in the normal order of things, to marry within their caste, receive a rudimentary education, and have a menial occupation. Indeed, if a member of that caste overtly expressed a desire to marry outside of the caste, attend school for more than an elementary education, or become a merchant, he would probably incur as severe a sanctioning from his peers as he would from those in other castes. In Europe during medieval and feudal times it was also considered legitimate to allow little opportunity for upward mobility in that society—a son should follow in the social and occupational footsteps of his father, be he aristocrat or peasant.

Of course, the norms concerning legitimacy change not only from society to society but within societies as the experience of a people changes. For example, the industrial revolution and the concomitant developments in communication, travel, and formal education, as well as the demand for more people to fill the increasingly large number of specialized roles in industry, allowed some social mobility in Europe.

B. Sponsored vs. Contest Mobility

Ralph Turner has characterized the type of mobility norm which developed in Europe as "sponsored mobility." This type of mobility is one whereby:

> *. . . elite recruits are chosen by the established elite or their agents, and elite status is given on the basis of some criterion of supposed merit and cannot be taken by any amount of effort or strategy. Upward mobility is like the entry into a private club where each candidate must be "sponsored" by one or more of the members. Ultimately the members grant or deny upward mobility on the basis of whether they judge the candidate to have those qualities they wish to see in fellow members.*[4]

Such a mobility norm is, therefore, a process of sponsored induction into the elite. The goal of this type of mobility is to make the best use of the talents in society by sorting persons into their proper niches.

In late nineteenth-century European society, the criteria for sponsorship were, in many respects, ascriptive in nature, i.e., they were predominantly based upon the social and economic position of the family. However, the demands of industrialization and World War I affected these criteria through an increased emphasis upon ability. As a result, high-achieving members of the lower middle and lower classes were also sponsored for elite positions.

The American collective experience, on the other hand, has been different from the European one. The early colonists, coming to this land for a variety of reasons, met a frontier quite different from anything they had known in Europe. It quickly became evident that the measure of a man was his ability to survive and help others survive, not his patrimony. Every man should try to succeed; in fact, success was the measure of a man. If the individual did not succeed it was because he, not society, was a failure. This frontier ethic,

---

[4]Ralph Turner, "Sponsored and Contest Mobility and the School System," *The American Sociological Review* 25 (December 1960): 855-867.

in combination with "the Protestant ethic,"[5] is an important factor in explaining the value which Americans typically put on achievement and success.

Such collective experiences served to create certain norms *vis-a-vis* social mobility within our society, i.e., norms embodying the concept of equality of opportunity and a folk norm of mobility termed by Turner as "contest mobility." According to Turner:

> *Contest mobility is a system in which elite status is the prize in an open contest and is taken by the aspirants' own efforts. While the "contest" is governed by some rules of fair play, the contestants have wide latitude in the strategies they may employ. Since the "prize" of successful upward mobility is not in the hands of an established elite to give out, the latter cannot determine who shall attain it and who shall not.*[6]

In this sense contest mobility has been likened to a sporting event in which many compete for a few recognized prizes. However, the contest is considered fair only if all compete on an equal footing. Victory must be won solely by one's own efforts. Thus the major objective of contest mobility is to grant elite status to those who earn it. To insure a fair race, contest mobility tends to delay the final award of the prize as long as is practical. Each person thinks of himself as competing for material success or an elite position. Indeed, it is essential to delay a sense of final failure as long as possible. Consequently, the contest system must avoid absolute points of selection of mobility or immobility and must delay clear recognition of the realities of the situation until the individual is too committed to the system to change radically.

Irrespective of the type of social mobility, certain factors facilitate or constrain mobility.

Perhaps the major external factor influencing mobility is economic. In periods of economic expansion, the possibilities of mobility open up. Indeed, mobility is necessary because society must fill those positions created by an expanding economy. Of course, even in periods of economic expansion, social mores may affect the extent to which certain segments of the population can take advantage of the expanding economy.

Another factor affecting mobility comes from the social structure of the society. As explained earlier, the exigencies of life among social groups comprising different occupational positions tend to stimulate the formation of norms which incorporate attitudes and values in response to these exigencies which, in themselves, may determine mobility patterns. In other words, those people who internalize attitudes and values not conducive to their success in a larger society are automatically restricted in the amount of mobility they can experience irrespective of an expanding economy.

In an open society, socialization into attitudes and values which inhibit advancement into the mainstream of society, and especially advancement into the occupational positions which would provide the material rewards desired, constitutes "disadvantagement." Legislators, scholars, and educators have only recently recognized this limit to contest mobility.

---

[5] An ethic described by Weber as emphasizing that God rewarded those preordained for heaven with material success. Therefore, in order to be sure that he was a chosen one, a person strove to be materially successful.

[6] Turner, "Sponsored and Contest Mobility," p. 856.

C. The Comprehensive Community College as an Agent of Social Mobility

Educators have responded to this awareness of limits to social mobility by sponsoring programs of compensatory education. This move toward compensatory education is one explanation of the tremendous growth of public two-year community colleges. In fact, the public two-year community college is an institutionalization of the "open class" ideology, just as, it may be argued, the comprehensive American secondary school operationalized the value earlier in this century. Indeed, the increasing importance of a college education in achieving upward social mobility, and, in some cases, employability *per se*, places heavy demands on the higher education establishment. Such demands are a consequence of society encouraging attempts (through the norm of "equal opportunity") by more of its members for status positions than there are places. This means that in addition to providing an avenue of mobility, society must develop a "safety valve" to avoid rebellion by those who cannot qualify in the ever-tighter competition for elite status positions.

The comprehensive public community college provides both an opportunity and a "safety valve" because it generally has an "open" admissions policy and provides for all types of academic and vocational training: (1) transfer or preprofessional education; (2) occupational education; (3) general education for all students; (4) community service, including continuing education; (5) guidance and counseling of students; and (6) remedial education. This type of institution, with more curricular offerings, extensive guidance and counseling, remedial education, and an emphasis on teaching, facilitates upward mobility into professional education and enables what Burton Clark termed the "cooling-out" process to function.[7] In essence, this is a process including pretesting, counseling, objective evaluations of aptitudes, orientation classes, and a liberal probationary policy through which the over-aspiring (latent terminal) student is counseled into an occupational role which is more compatible with his abilities and motivation. Basically, the student accumulates mounting evidence through several terms that he will not succeed in the transfer program but that he probably could succeed in the occupational program. Thus the student is given the "opportunity" to compete for elite status but finally reconciles himself to an occupational role which was initially less desirable. What is important is that this sequence of events leads the individual to consider failure as an individual event and not as a part of a conspiracy. In other words, aspirants for higher occupational positions who did not previously internalize the attitudes and values necessary for success in traditional education programs are provided with the perception that they: (1) can participate in the contest, (2) are participating in the contest, and (3) that if they do not succeed, it is not the fault of the system, but has something to do with themselves. This perception is accentuated when those who must readjust their goals see that some of their academic and social peers are successful in entering and in pursuing the transfer program. In this way, the community college serves as an agent for maintaining social stability.[8]

---

[7]Burton Clark, "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education," *The American Journal of Sociology* 65 (May 1960): 569-76.

[8]It should be noted that this role of the public two-year college is a latent function in that it is not a stated function of the community college nor is it a recognized function by most of those who either attend or support this institution.

Given this conception of the role of the two-year college in American society, it is important to examine the nature and extent of compensatory education programs in these colleges. The following sections of this report discuss the nature and rationale of such programs in higher education and the extent to which they exist in two-year colleges first as reported in the literature and then as practiced by the two-year colleges who participated in our survey.[9]

## II. Current Compensatory Practices and Programs in Higher Education as Described in the Literature

There are two major categories of compensatory education programs and practices: (1) those that assist culturally different students in entering institutions of higher education and (2) those that help them succeed in academic and occupational-oriented studies once they have enrolled.

Compensatory practices that assist culturally different students in *entering* institutions of higher education include modified recruitment, admissions, and financial aid. Instruction in basic communication skills, teaching English as a second language, tutorial programs, flexible evaluation, extended school experience, summer programs, cultural enrichment, Black studies, special instructional practices, and extensive guidance and counseling are important compensatory practices designed to assist the culturally different to *succeed* once they enroll. The programs which are currently organized by institutions in order to meet the particular needs of such students generally combine some of these practices.

### A. Compensatory Education Entry Practices

#### 1. Modified Recruitment

For culturally different students, traditional recruitment practices such as the annual spring visitation of college representatives to the high schools have not always been effective. Colleges have had to modify or create specific recruitment practices to attract culturally different students. These special practices have been utilized by federally sponsored programs such as Upward Bound and the College Discovery Program, where students were actively sought out in their own communities to enter institutions of higher education.

A few colleges have developed even more aggressive recruitment practices. One urban two-year college placed high school counselors on its payroll for recruitment services in the high schools where they were normally employed after the regular school hours and on Saturday. The purpose was to recruit students for the community college who would not normally plan to go on with their education without some very special kind of encouragement from the school.[10]

---

[9]As noted earlier, the thesis of this investigation deals primarily with publicly supported two-year colleges. However, an argument could be developed that privately supported two-year colleges also bear some responsibility for societal maintenance, although their obligations in this realm are not as extensive as public institutions. For this reason, they are included in this study.

[10]Dorothy M. Knoell, "Outreach to the Disadvantaged," *Community College Programs for People Who Need College* (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970), p. 6.

At Tufts University, 150 undergraduate students traveled throughout the country seeking to interest non-white disadvantaged students in college attendance. Michigan State University worked with a group of nonprofessional adults, housewives, firemen, and other community groups to find qualified Black students for its special program. Antioch College sent out recruitment teams to inner-city areas to recruit students for its special program for the disadvantaged. Southern Illinois University sent their recruitment teams to local high schools where records were searched to locate students. Also, advertisements were placed in newspapers and on radio and television. SIU recruitment team members even visited pool halls, bars, and street corners in search of potential students.[11]

Some colleges solicit nominations of culturally different students considered potentially successful for compensatory programs from members of their student body. Other colleges have developed a list of contacts, such as high school faculty members, social workers, and neighborhood groups. These contacts are consulted for leads to those students who might qualify as potential college material. Another method of recruitment has been initiated by the federally sponsored "New Careers" program where adult members over twenty-one years of age who are currently in the program attempt to recruit other culturally different persons within the community to enter the two-year program.[12]

2. Modified Financial Aid

Most culturally different students require some type of financial aid. This aid is often provided directly or indirectly to institutions of higher education for their special programs through federal, state, and local sources.[13] Aid has also been obtained through foundations, fund drives, and donations from special interest groups, as well as from the operating budgets of institutions of higher education.

B. Compensatory Education for Institutional Success

1. Instruction in Basic Communication Skills

Compared with those from middle class backgrounds, students from culturally different backgrounds are generally less able to use conventional verbal symbols in representing and interpreting their feelings, experiences, and environment.[14] Language stimulation usually results in language development; therefore, it becomes important to extend language experiences for the culturally different in order to develop their ability to problem solve and transfer knowledge of previously learned concepts. Because of the weakness of most of the students in the communication skills, work in this area is essential for their academic progress.

---

[11]John Egerton, *Higher Education for High Risk Students* (Atlanta: Southern Education Reporting Service, 1968), pp. 19-42.

[12]Knoell, "Outreach," pp. 6-8.

[13]Edmund W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson, *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966), p. 138.

[14]Martin Deutsch, Irwin Katz, and Arthur R. Janse, *Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), pp. 116-120.

Many compensatory programs in higher education concentrate on the development of communication skills—reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Numerous programs concerned with communication skills include intensive compensatory work prior to entering institutions of higher education and during the regular school term.[15] In addition, the use of standard English is taught in programs designed specifically for the culturally different in such a way that the student's own dialect is not undermined.

2. English As a Second Language

For many students, especially Blacks and Puerto Ricans, standard English is a second language. Students in predominantly Black institutions have the most problems in attempting to learn standard English. As Love indicates, these problems are quite pressing, and may be overwhelming: "The teaching of English in Negro colleges is presently at a standstill—with teachers despairing student apathy and inadequacy and students abandoning any hope of mastering standard English."[16]

Some success has been encountered in teaching standard English when Black dialect is used as a basis for instruction. Textbooks and materials that present standard English as a second language utilize foreign language techniques that are helpful for those accustomed to speaking the nonstandard dialect.[17]

3. Tutorial Programs

Compensatory programs are often developed with the assumption that the culturally different have academic abilities which are inadequate for the traditional college classroom. In order to assist these students in realizing their potential, some institutions have developed special tutorial programs to support classroom activities. These programs have provided extensive individual tutoring in academic areas, with some schools developing corps of tutors which include teachers, graduate students, regular undergraduate students, and advanced students from culturally different backgrounds. The latter have been found to be particularly effective tutors since their success is also evidence of a chance for success to the newer students.[18]

Tutoring is generally used to facilitate the strengths and compensate for the weaknesses of the culturally different student, to develop his confidence, and to aid in his adjustment to college. In addition, tutoring provides the opportunity for him to have assistance and feedback when he needs it. Questions raised in the lecture hall or the large class often remain unanswered, as the student, insecure because of his academic deficiencies, is probably hesitant to speak in such a large group setting. Through the tutoring program, questions are answered as they arise and mistakes corrected when they are made thereby facilitating the development of confidence in a mastery of academic subjects.

---

[15]Robert L. Williams, "What Are We Learning From Current Programs for the Disadvantaged?" *Journal of Higher Education* 40 (1969): 285.

[16]Theresa R. Love, "Needs and Approaches for Developing Linguistic Abilities," *Journal of Negro Education* 35 (1966): 400.

[17]Williams, p. 274.

[18]Williams, p. 196.

Many community colleges are providing opportunities and encouragement to their students to tutor in inner city schools. Some tutoring is voluntary and some is funded by the colleges, many times through state and federal programs. For example, Project EPIC in Los Angeles is voluntary, whereas students in the San Mateo College Readiness Program and Peralta Junior College District in Oakland receive payment for their tutoring services.[19]

4. Flexible Evaluation

Institutions of higher education do not generally lower their grading standards or requirements for graduation for the culturally different. However, two-year schools often have liberal probation policies for these students. Such schools permit students to repeat courses or give them the opportunity to take additional work to raise their grade-point average to a level where they can meet institutional minimal requirements.[20]

Some major concerns that give support to the concept of flexible evaluation for the culturally different are noted by Gordon and Wilkerson:

1. No single factor can be isolated as the cause of low test performance scores.
2. Verbal facility and perceptual ability are two of the most critical factors of the cognitive domain reflected in test performance.
3. Intelligence development varies with the richness, variety, and complexity of the environment over relatively extended periods of time.
4. Low test scores are often a reflection of a negative self-concept and insufficient motivation.
5. The work of the school and the practical intellect of the disadvantaged are often operating as contradictory forces.
6. Assessment instruments used with disadvantaged groups often possess only minimal validity and reliability.[21]

While there is generally little flexibility regarding grading practices, change in this area could have an important effect on implementing the concept of the "open door." For example, the elimination of penalty grading could help to alter the emphasis from punishing unacceptable academic behavior to rewarding appropriate behavior. Capper has noted that fears by some administrators that less punitive grading practices would lead to greater student irresponsibility have not been warranted.[22]

5. Extended School Experience

The concept of extended school experience is a part of many collegiate programs for the culturally different. This extended program can include precollege orientation and remedial work to assist the student in preparing for his first year of school, summer courses to

---

[19]Knoell, "Outreach," p. 7.

[20]Michael R. Capper, "Junior College Students on Academic Probation," *ERIC Junior College Research Review* 4 (1969):2.

[21]Gordon and Wilkerson, *Compensatory Education*, pp. 18-19.

[22]Capper, p. 3.

help him develop special skills needed for his regular program, and the extension of a regular program by several terms.[23]

The extended school experience requires a commitment from the college to give the student enough time to succeed. In the HEW 1970 *Application and Program Manual for the Disadvantaged*, the idea of an extended program includes the minimum time a school should retain a student and the additional time over the regular program period which a student might need to complete his program. It states:

> *A minimum for retention (extended program) regardless of grades, might be two years in a four-year institution and one year in a two-year institution. In addition, the institution might develop a program where a student can take what normally would be two years' work in three years, so that at a four-year institution, he would graduate in five years.*[24]

Disadvantaged students enter two- and four-year institutions with academic deficiencies that often require additional time in classes and special compensatory programs that would not normally be required of the regular students. The extension of the regular program also provides the institution with the additional time needed to develop curricular program modifications to meet students' special needs and time for these students to take compensatory courses, retake courses, or repeat experiences with which they have not been successful in their initial attempt.

6. Summer Sessions

As previously noted, most culturally different students have some kind of academic deficiency and require additional knowledge of and training in communication skills and subject content when they enroll. In response to this need, many colleges and universities have developed summer programs to provide the background and skills that are essential to academic success in their institutions.

Some two-year colleges require summer terms as a condition for acceptance into their regular academic programs. These programs sometimes start immediately after official admission to the college and provide instruction in basic college academic requirements.[25]

Summer programs often begin before a student starts his first year. These programs cover basic reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills, in addition to the body of information needed to assure the student some chance of success with the curriculum he has selected. Summer sessions are not limited to pre-entrance, however, and can extend for three or four years after a student has begun his studies.[26]

---

[23]Gordon and Wilkerson, *Compensatory Education*, pp. 140-148.

[24]Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Institutions of Higher Education Programs," *USOE Application Information and Program Manual*, OE Form 1215, No. 3, 1970, p. 5.

[25]Rachel D. Wilkinson, "Discovery in the Bronx," *Community College Programs for People Who Need College* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970), p. 36.

[26]Gordon and Wilkerson, pp. 140-148.

Summer sessions are often an essential element of programs for the culturally different since additional assistance is generally needed to improve communication skills and content background. Small classes and individual tutoring to meet the special cognitive and affective needs of the student can often be better handled during the summer terms when time and personnel are generally more available and when a relaxed atmosphere generally exists.

7. Cultural Enrichment

It is widely accepted that culturally different students lack the kinds of experiences that middle class students have had which assist in their success in the traditional school system. Culturally different students are usually from the inner cities and rural areas of the South. Opportunities for these students to share in the cultural experiences of the middle and upper classes generally are not available. These very experiences, however, are essential for the student to understand and function in the cultural ethos found in most colleges and universities.

In an effort to provide these experiences, institutions of higher education often conduct special activities for the culturally different students. Such experiences as tours, trips to historical sights and museums, concerts, or "socials" have been used to narrow cultural gaps.

The United States Office of Education, in suggesting types of special services for the culturally different, has noted that some programs for these students are based in cultural centers separate from college direction, with students determining their activities. In addition to providing needed social contacts for the student, such cultural centers are supposed to serve as sources for dissemination of the program's activities to other students through publications, dramatic productions, art shows, open houses, and the like.[27] The main distinction between the college-sponsored cultural activities and the activities of the student cultural centers is that the culturally different students' own culture is exemplified and emphasized in the activities of the student centers.

Both types of cultural enrichment (that provided for the students and that which the students develop themselves) are helpful in assisting students to function effectively in higher education and in the broader society, both in terms of strengthening ethnic and racial pride and in terms of assisting minority groups in becoming more aware of the cultural symbols of middle class society.

8. Black Studies

The black American has recognized the inequalities which have existed for him in the educational institutions of our country. He has long attended schools without the opportunity to realize the many contributions of his race in the development of this society. As a result, the black American has often felt that his race has contributed little to the development of America.

---

[27]Department of Health, Education and Welfare, "Special Services," p. 7.

Racial pride comes, in part, from identifying with the great leaders of one's race and contributions made by members of it. Black studies programs and courses in higher education deal specifically with these contributions as well as with the unique heritage and problems of Black Americans. Such programs create a climate which enables the Black disadvantaged to develop a healthy concept of themselves, "a concept which tells them that as individuals they have dignity and worth, a concept which reflects confidence in the ultimate achievements of their goals."[28]

Until the late sixties, few Black studies programs or courses dealing specifically with Black culture were included in the regular college programs.[29] In larger colleges, the Black studies courses were generally placed under a separate department, with students determining selection of instructors. Black studies courses have proliferated in the last two years in colleges.[30] In a recent study, Lombardi concluded that the number of Black studies courses is greater in schools with higher Black enrollments, that students and instructors in these courses are mostly Black, and that favorable administration and board attitudes have a positive effect on enrollment in these courses.[31]

With the growing need for knowledge of the unique cultural heritage and contributions of Black Americans, it has become essential for them to have programs and courses in Black studies within institutions of higher education. These courses assist in strengthening racial and ethnic pride. The Black student in higher education may be given a sense of involvement and security in society from his involvement in Black studies. He can develop racial pride through an awareness that his ancestors contributed much to the growth and development of this country.

9. Special Instructional Practices

Since most of the culturally different come to institutions of higher education with academic deficiencies, it is important that instructional practices and programs be developed to meet these deficiencies. Standard techniques of presenting the subject matter of the disciplines are usually unsuccessful in motivating such students, thereby necessitating modified instructional practices. Such techniques and practices often include highly individualized instruction in communication skills along with the use of a wide variety of methods to facilitate learning in conventional subject matter courses.[32]

---

[28]Joan Ferrante, *The Negro American: A Reading List for Elementary Teachers* (Glassboro, New Jersey: Educational Improvement Center, 1969), p. 8.

[29]John Lombardi, "Black Studies," *ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges,* No. 13 (1971):7.

[30]Doris A. Meek, "Black Power and the Instructional Council," *Community College Programs for People Who Need College* (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Junior Colleges, 1970), p. 54.

[31]Lombardi, "Black Studies," p. 7.

[32]Susan Koester, "Chicago City College: A Center for Innovation," *Community College Programs for People Who Need College* (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Junior Colleges, 1970), p. 62.

For example, Daytona Beach (Florida) Junior College has developed a guided studies program for all students admitted with academic deficiencies. Central Florida Junior College has a voluntary guided studies program for students who have been identified as low achievers on the basis of achievement tests and high school records. This program uses teachers who have expressed interest in the program and who have had a minimum of twelve years of experience in high school and junior colleges. In Chicago City College, a block plan has been used in teaching courses for low-achieving students where students take courses in speech, English, writing, and reading, along with one other course from ethics, biology, or social studies. Every effort is made to personalize instruction and counseling. A five-session noncredit survival seminar was developed by the College of the Mainland in Texas, where a counselor and reading specialist, along with regular teachers, prepared lessions in notetaking, reading, preparing for and taking tests, scheduling time for class assignments, study, and recreation.[33]

In some cases, junior colleges conduct classes "on-site" with the actual equipment and materials that the students will eventually be using for their jobs after graduation. In other instances, colleges train the student partially in the classroom and partially on-site.

10. Guidance and Counseling

Guidance and counseling services are an essential element in programs for the culturally different. These services assist in locating such students, in determining what preentrance competencies are necessary for entrance, and in assisting them in applying for financial aid. Such services also include diagnostic testing, a useful technique in placing students in the appropriate curricular offering of the institution.

Once students are enrolled, counselors follow their progress closely in order to determine if any curricular changes or modifications need to be made. As the students complete their programs, counselors make them aware of opportunities for employment or further formal education. Counselors may also be involved with designing and implementing follow-up services such as planning visits for students at senior colleges and maintaining contacts with industry, hospitals, and public agencies for placement.

A recent innovation in counseling and guidance services has been the use of the ombudsman who maintains relations between students and faculty, students and administration, and students and the institution. In effect, he acts the role of supra-counselor in being able to represent and negotiate on all fronts with the support of all college groups.[34]

C. Federally Sponsored Programs (USOE)

The increased attention given the culturally different student in the past few years by the federal government has resulted in a number of programs which have provided aid and assistance to many institutions of higher education and their culturally different populations. These programs have attempted to focus on areas of greatest need and include support for recruitment, special services, student aid, professional employment, curriculum de-

---

[33]B. Lamar Johnson, *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College* (Beverly Hills, California: Glencoe Press, 1969), pp. 193-196.

[34]Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Special Services," pp. 37-38.

| RELEVANT USOE PROGRAMS | EDUCATIONAL SERVICES |
|---|---|
| Talent Search<br>Upward Bound<br>Guidance and Counseling Aid | Recruitment of students; admissions policies; guidance and counseling |
| Special Services Program<br>Student Tutoring via Work-Study | Special services |
| Federal Grants (EOG), loans, work-study; GI Bill and related veterans' programs | Student aid |
| EPDA institutes and scholarships for teachers | Employment of professionals from minority group backgrounds (faculty, guidance, administration) qualified to teach the culturally different |
| Bureau of Research funds | Curriculum development and development of new teaching methods, especially in fields such as Black-ethnic studies and urban studies |
| Funds from EPDA, ESEA, and other programs (i.e., Head Start Supplementary Training) | Teaching paraprofessionals |
| Funds available under VEA for operating costs of programs, equipment, teacher training, etc. | Post-secondary vocational education |
| Limited funds under HEA, Title I | Adult and continuing education |
| EPDA; to some extent NDEA IV graduate fellowships | Training teachers and other professionals to work with disadvantaged |
| Bureau of Research | Educational research into problems of the culturally different |
| Developing Colleges (HEA, Title III); Facilities grants and loans; Higher education equipment grants (HEA Title, VI-A); College Housing Loan Program | Aid to institutions, including two-year colleges and predominantly Negro colleges |
| College Library Aid (HEA, Title II) | Aid to libraries at such colleges |

velopment, teaching paraprofessionals, post-secondary vocational education, adult and continuing education, training teachers, research related to the culturally different, and library aid.

The following U.S. Office of Education programs and services have been developed to assist the culturally different in higher education. While some of these programs have appropriations which are far too small to make significant changes in the educational patterns of the culturally different (e.g., Upward Bound, Special Services, Student Aid), they have provided services in areas where previously little or no help was available.

D. AACJC Policy Statement on Programs for the Culturally Different in Two-Year Colleges

1. Policy Direction

A recent statement of policy with respect to the role of two-year colleges in serving the culturally different was formulated by the Associate Board of Directors of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. This statement of policy maintained that one of the principal cures for poverty is education; that it is through education that many educationally, socially, and economically handicapped youth may be brought into the mainstream of American life.

In terms of commitment, the association resolved that two-year colleges should expand their role in helping poor students and youth who wish to take advantage of the opportunities for higher education. This includes all students whether they are white, Black, Puerto Rican, or Mexican American. Each two-year college should formulate its own orientation for commitment. The commitment should include special programs, practices, and procedures which will serve culturally different students. In terms of implementation, AACJC will continue to encourage and expand programs which it has initiated and which it has encouraged two-year colleges to develop. These programs include the Outreach Demonstration Projects, currently conducted in four urban colleges and coordinated nationally by AACJC.

AACJC has also encouraged specific institutional orientation through proposals in specific areas which include: (1) the development, replication, and testing of curriculum models in as many as ten community and junior colleges; (2) basic research improving various educational services to the disadvantaged, such as those fostered in the OEO-supported projects; (3) expanded research on the effect of campus site selection; (4) conferences on basic remedial/bridge programs in community and junior colleges; and (5) pilot work and staff development to prepare junior college personnel to carry out basic research and developmental projects in their programs for the culturally different.[35]

E. Examples of Compensatory Programs in Two-Year Colleges

1. Cuyahoga Community College

---

[35]Edmund Gleazer, "Programs for the Disadvantaged: A Policy Statement of the AAJC," *Junior College Journal* 40 (1969):3-4.

This public two-year college, opened in 1963, has served thousands of Clevelanders by providing university parallel and technical occupational courses. In addition, it has attempted to meet specific community needs through such projects as (1) college skills program, (2) Project Search (an educational counseling referral agency), (3) Project EVE (information, counseling, and referral service for adult women interested in continuing education, volunteer work, and employment), and (4) Project New Careers (training inner-city men and women within Cleveland). The New Careers aspect in particular has been aimed at easing the manpower shortage and improving services in health and welfare by restructuring job hiring; it has developed new approahces to the education and training of the undereducated, underemployed, and the unemployed which are geared to their specific life styles. Cuyahoga's programs have already had a strategic effect in Cleveland and serve as a standard model for other community college programs which are aimed specifically at serving community needs.[36]

2. Project Focus[37]

Project Focus is a continuation and extension of the Upward Bound program (preparatory program for low income students). This program seeks broad community participation through finding host families for its students. In particular, Project Focus has helped make the resources of two-year colleges available to Upward Bound students. It also has placed students in colleges in parts of the country which are new to them. For example, Peralta College (California), located in an all white, predominantly middle class community, received a number of Black students from Florida, Louisiana, and Texas after Project Focus assisted in locating host family relationships and work study positions for them in the area.

Many schools throughout the country have been involved in similar Project Focus activities. While the total number of students so placed is small (only eighty students in twenty-five colleges during the 1968-69 academic year), Project Focus intends to expand fourfold in the 1969-70 school year.[38]

3. Florida Community Colleges

In Florida, community college programs designed to meet the educational needs of the disadvantaged student take the form of special courses and services. Of the twenty-four colleges reporting in a recent Florida survey, most had some form of compensatory education program consisting largely of specialized courses. These special courses were used in conjunction with special services at thirteen of the institutions and with regular courses at two of the colleges. Only at one school were all three available: the regular courses, special courses, and special services.[39]

---

[36]Carl B. Stokes, *Social Action and the Community College* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970), pp. 18-21.

[37]This project should not be confused with a project with the same title funded by the Kellogg Foundation for studying the reorganization of the then AAJC.

[38]William A. Strauss, *From Upward Bound to the Junior College—The Focus Way* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970), pp. 29-30.

[39]Michael I. Shaffer, Edward Boddy, and Winston T. Bridges, Jr., *Implementing the Open Door: Compensatory Education in Florida's Community Colleges* (Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Community Junior College Inter-Institutional Research Council, 1970), p. 25.

4. Inner-City Project of Peralta

This project was a federally-sponsored demonstration project designed to be part of a nation-wide program to determine the capability of two-year colleges to meet the needs and problems of the inner city poor. Four centers were established in the poorer areas of the junior college district. Student and professional staffs were located at these centers to assist Blacks, Mexican Americans, and other ethnic group members by conducting short-term courses in legal rights, household management, child care, English, and a number of academic and career courses. The courses were conducted in various locations within the neighborhoods, such as churches and civic centers. In addition, a scholarship system was developed to provide financial aid for the inner city residents involved in the program.[40]

F. Summary

The foregoing review has described the nature of the compensatory practices and programs as they appear in the literature. We will now turn our attention to an empirical examination of the extent to which these practices and programs exist in public and private two-year colleges in the United States. We will also examine the admissions policies, admissions requirements, counseling services, and curricular offerings of two-year colleges in this country.

## III. Survey Results

A. Methodological Considerations

1. Research Design

Given the earlier discussion of the comprehensive community college and compensatory education practices in institutions of higher education as currently described in the literature, our methodological considerations revolve around surveying the admissions policies, curricular offerings, and compensatory education practices of a representative sample of two-year colleges. (See Appendix A.)

A pre-coded questionnaire (see Appendix B) was developed for this study and sent to the chief administrative officer of those public two-year institutions participating in the annual research on "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen" conducted by the American Council on Education (ACE). The ACE data bank contains fifty-three public and private two-year colleges. These institutions, randomly selected from all two-year institutions in the United States, were placed in stratification cells by type of control and by size as reflected by first time enrollment (see Table 1). Since sampling from the stratification cells for two-year colleges was disproportionate to the population of these cells, the data obtained from institutions in each are differentially weighted. The number of institutions in each stratification cell, the cell weight applied to each institution as a consequence of re-

---

[40]Paul A. Elsner, *The Peralta College's Inner-City Project* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970), pp. 1-34.

siding in that cell, and the sample response of this study by stratification cell are also given in Table 1.[41] In order to illustrate representativeness of the population of all two-year colleges in the United States, the data reported in the following section are based upon the weighted N as opposed to the actual N.

2. Data Analysis

The data analysis first considers admissions policies, admissions requirements, counseling services, and enrollment in curricular programs of two-year colleges in this country. The next section analyzes the number of public or private institutions which (1) have developed a special program for the academically disadvantaged, (2) have developed courses which could be classified as remedial or developmental, or (3) have developed special services, e.g., tutoring, counseling, and/or financial aid for those who are academically disadvantaged. The analysis also describes the specific nature of the programs and/or services for the minority group academically disadvantaged.[42]

B. Data Analysis

1. Admissions Policies

Almost 100 percent of our respondents in public two-year colleges indicate that they have open admissions for in-district students (see Table 2). However, 86 percent of these respondents require a high school diploma or equivalent, 27 percent have a minimum age requirement, 28 percent require test scores, 7 percent require an interview, 16 percent require a letter of recommendation, and 41 percent require a physical examination[43] (see Table 3). Thirty-four percent of public two-year colleges require only a high school diploma or equivalent; 5 percent have only an age requirement; 55 percent require both a high school diploma (or equivalent) and a minimum age, but nothing more.

As one would expect, less than 20 percent of the nonpublic two-year colleges have an open admissions policy (see Table 2) and 97 percent require at least a high school diploma or equivalent of admission. In addition, it should be noted that 82 percent require test scores, and 81 percent require letters of recommendation for admission. Only 3 percent require either a high school diploma or minimum age for admission (see Table 3).

---

[41]The return response for this study was 90 percent. One advantage of the stratification design of this study is that it allows us to assume more reasonably that no severe biases obtain, given a high response rate. In other words, since the most crucial factors which differentiate between institutions have been controlled, institutions within stratification cells are, for all intents and purposes, interchangeable.

[42]Programs for the minority group academically disadvantaged are the focus in this analysis under the assumption that this group accurately represents the culturally different category previously defined.

[43]It may be, of course, that test scores, interviews, letters of recommendation, and physical examinations are required only for purposes of placement or counseling.

2. Counseling Services

Almost all public two-year colleges have some form of personal counseling services, academic counseling services, and vocational-occupational counseling services (see Table 4). In addition, 95 percent of these colleges have job placement counseling services, and 72 percent have job placement follow-up counseling services. These statistics may be compared with private two-year colleges in the ACE data bank sample. Of the private institutions, only a little over 60 percent provide vocational-occupational counseling and only a little over 40 indicate that they have job placement counseling. Furthermore, only 10 percent of the private institutions indicate that they have job placement follow-up counseling. In summary, some 95 percent of public two-year colleges indicate that they have personal, academic, vocational-occupational, and job placement counseling whereas approximately 28 percent of private two-year colleges have all of those services.

3. Curricular Offerings

Every public two-year college surveyed has an academic transfer program and an occupational associate degree program. In addition, a little over 75 percent of the public two-year colleges have an occupational certificate program. Almost 70 percent of the public institutions in the sample have a continuing education program; and 46 percent have students enrolled in developmental, preparatory, or remedial programs (see Table 5). Fourteen percent of the public schools in the sample have only transfer and associate degree occupational programs, and slightly over 25 percent of our sample have a transfer, occupational-associate degree, occupational-certificate and continuing education programs. Forty percent of our sample of public two-year colleges have all of the occupational programs typically associated with the ideal-typic community college, i.e., academic, occupational-associate degree, occupational-certificate, continuing education, and developmental programs.

The overwhelming majority of private two-year colleges have an academic program and close to three-quarters of them have an occupational-associate degree program. Fourteen percent have an occupational certificate program and 9 percent have some form of continuing education program. Only 7 percent report a developmental program, and 9 percent report all of the above types of programs except the remedial.

4. Special Programs, Courses, or Services for the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged

Close to 40 percent of the public two-year colleges surveyed have special programs for the academically disadvantaged as opposed to approximately one-fifth of the private two-year colleges (see Table 6). On the other hand, almost all of the public two-year colleges have developed special courses for the academically disadvantaged[44] while two-thirds of the private two-year colleges have such courses. Finally, almost all public two-year colleges and 66 percent of the private two-year colleges have developed special services for the academically disadvantaged. Almost 40 percent of the public two-year colleges have special programs, special courses, and special services for the academically disadvantaged, as opposed to 19 percent of private two-year colleges. However, all public two-year colleges and 76 percent

[44]A discrepancy should be noted here: only 46 percent of the participating institutions indicated that they actually had students enrolled in a remedial program. This means that colleges either have remedial courses in which there is no enrollment, or that administrators do not consider a course as constituting a program.

of the private two-year colleges indicated that they had *either* a special program *or* special courses *or* special services for the academically disadvantaged.

It is interesting to note that 51 percent of the public two-year colleges with a comprehensive program indicated that they had a special program for the academically disadvantaged as opposed to 30 percent of those without a comprehensive program.

5. Characteristics of Programs and Services for the Academically Disadvantaged

In this section we are specifically concerned with the nature of special programs and/or services for the minority group academically disadvantaged in public or private schools.[45]

a. Recruitment

Slightly over 35 percent of public two-year colleges have recruitment teams for the minority group academically disadvantaged (see Table 7). Of those private two-year colleges reporting these special programs, services, or courses for the academically disadvantaged, one-third report using recruitment teams. Three-fourths of the public two-year colleges reported using a list of community contacts to recruit minority group academically disadvantaged students, as opposed to approximately one-tenth of the private institutions (see Table 7).

b. Guidance, Counseling, and Instructional Services

Some 89 percent of the public two-year colleges reported guidance and counseling services above the ordinary for the minority group academically disadvantaged. Over 85 percent of the private two-year colleges reported this practice. With respect to special tutoring, again almost all (91 percent) of the public two-year colleges reported this practice, as opposed to slightly over 75 percent of the private two-year colleges. Of those institutions using regular faculty as tutors, 95 percent of the public two-year colleges and 89 percent of the private two-year colleges have this practice. Slightly over fifty-five percent of the public two-year colleges and almost 70 percent of the private two-year colleges utilized specially trained faculty in tutoring academically disadvantaged minority group students. Almost 80 percent of the public two-year colleges and all of the private two-year colleges used regular students in tutoring academically disadvantaged students. Interestingly enough, 65 percent of the public two-year colleges and 80 percent of the private two-year schools used advanced students in the program as tutors (see Table 8).

With respect to instruction, close to three-quarters of both public and private two-year colleges report the use of programmed instructional techniques. Over 85 percent of public two-year colleges and over 70 percent of private two-year colleges report the practice of reduced course load for academically disadvantaged students. Slightly over half of the public and slightly under half of the private two-year colleges used liberalized probationary or readmission practices for minority group academically disadvantaged. Ninety percent of public and private two-year colleges provide instruction in the development of study skills to minority group academically disadvantaged students. All public two-year colleges with pro-

[45]As the reader may note above, 100 percent of the public and 76 percent of the private institutions fall within this category.

grams, courses, or services for the academically disadvantaged stress communication skills; 90 percent of private two-year colleges do the same. Of those public and private two-year colleges who report stressing communication skills, all stress reading skills. Slightly over 90 percent of the public and private two-year colleges stress writing skills. Over 75 percent of the public and private two-year colleges stress speaking skills. Eighty-three percent of public two-year colleges and close to 40 percent of the private two-year colleges stress listening skills. Sixty percent of the public and private two-year colleges stress the utilization of traditional English. Over half of the public two-year colleges and 45 percent of the private two-year colleges stress an understanding of the student's own dialect as a language system in their stress on communication skills for the minority group academically disadvantaged. Finally, 17 percent of public two-year colleges and 16 percent of private two-year colleges prepare special courses of particular ethnic studies for minority grouped academically disadvantaged students (see Table 9).

c. Financial Aid

Slightly over 90 percent of the public two-year colleges and 83 percent of private two-year colleges who have special programs, courses, or services for the academically disadvantaged report that they offer these students financial aid. Approximately 40 percent of both public and private two-year colleges reported aid to minority group disadvantaged in the form of federal scholarships. Slightly over 65 percent of the public two-year colleges and slightly over 45 percent of the private two-year colleges reported financial aid in the form of a federal guaranteed loan to academically disadvantaged minority group students. Approximately 80 percent of public two-year colleges and over 60 percent of private two-year colleges reported federal work study programs. Approximately 10 percent of public two-year colleges and slightly over 5 percent of private two-year colleges reported a federal co-op program at their institution. Seventeen percent of public two-year colleges and 27 percent of private two-year colleges reported other forms of federal aid to academically disadvantaged minority group students. Only 5 percent of public two-year colleges and no private two-year colleges reported receiving no federal aid of any kind for academically disadvantaged students (see Table 10).

Over 60 percent of public two-year colleges and 17 percent of private two-year colleges report that their academically disadvantaged minority group students receive some form of state scholarship aid. Almost 30 percent of the academically disadvantaged minority group students in public two-year colleges and 7 percent of such students in private two-year colleges receive the benefits of a state guaranteed loan. Over 40 percent of academically disadvantaged minority students at public two-year colleges and 7 percent of such students at private two-year colleges have some form of state work-study grants. However, only 2 percent of students at public two-year colleges and no students at private two-year colleges who are academically disadvantaged minority group students are part of a state co-op program. Three percent of academically disadvantaged minority group students in public two-year colleges receive some other form of state aid. In sum, slightly over 80 percent of the academically disadvantaged minority group students in both public and private two-year colleges receive some form of state financial aid (see Table 11).

All two-year colleges, both public and private, responding to our survey questionnaire indicated that the institution provided financial support to minority group academically disadvantaged students whom they enrolled in special programs, courses, or services.

Over 60 percent of public two-year colleges and over 50 percent of private two-year colleges gave much of this aid in the form of institutional scholarships. Slightly over 20 percent of public two-year colleges and 17 percent of private two-year colleges aided academically disadvantaged minority group students in the form of an institutional guaranteed loan. Approximately 40 percent of public two-year colleges and almost half of the private two-year colleges provided financial aid in the form of institutional work-study programs. Some 5 percent of public two-year colleges and 20 percent of private two-year colleges rendered financial aid in the form of an institutional co-op program (see Table 12).

Slightly over 82 percent of public two-year colleges and all private two-year colleges reported that some form of private aid was dispensed among academically disadvantaged minority group students. For example, slightly over 50 percent of public two-year colleges and 44 percent of private two-year colleges reported that scholarship aid to academically disadvantaged minority group students came from private sources. Guaranteed loans from private sources were reported in 16 percent of public two-year colleges and 13 percent of private two-year colleges. Some 10 percent of public two-year colleges and over 25 percent of private two-year colleges reported that work-study programs were supported from private sources. Although no public two-year college reported that a cooperative program stemming from private sources existed at their institution, 7 percent of private two-year colleges indicated that they had such a program (see Table 13).

d. Training Programs for Faculty

As noted in our discussion above, many schools have programs for training faculty who deal with academically disadvantaged students. In response to questions regarding whether an institution had any special instructional or training programs to assist their faculty in working with academically deficient students, some 28 percent of public two-year colleges and 45 percent of the private two-year colleges responded affirmatively. Unfortunately, we did not ask if any of their faculty had previous training which would assist them in working with such students. We doubt that many such programs exist in contemporary university graduate programs.

## IV. Summary, Conclusions, and Implications

As noted earlier, the public two-year college in its exemplary (comprehensive) form is an open admissions institution characterized by diverse curricular offerings (transfer, occupational-associate degree, and occupational-certificate), with a heavy emphasis on guidance and counseling, as well as an emphasis on compensatory and continuing education.

One purpose of this paper was to review the literature in higher education concerning compensatory education, concentrating on those programs and practices that assist culturally different students in entering institutions of higher education, as well as those programs which assist them in succeeding once they have enrolled. Accordingly, we reviewed examples of recruitment, admissions, and financial aid practices that serve to assist these students to enter institutions of higher education. We have also reviewed examples of instructional programs in basic communication skills, tutorial programs, summer programs, evaluation, cultural enrichment programs, ethnic studies programs, and special guidance and counseling services designed to assist the culturally different once they have enrolled.

The major focus of this study has been, however, to empirically examine by a survey of community colleges the nature and extent to which these compensatory practices and programs exist in two-year colleges for the minority group academically disadvantaged.

Utilizing a sampling design developed by the research staff of the American Council on Education, the conclusions of our survey may be considered (subject to the normal limitations of survey research) as representative of all two-year colleges in this country.

It is praiseworthy that the public two-year colleges in this country maintain the guidance and counseling services which characterize the exemplary community college. As noted in the analysis, almost all two-year colleges have personal, academic, vocational-occupational, and job placement counseling. This finding is encouraging, particularly in an institution characterized by such a variety of student interests, aptitudes, and abilities, where counseling is critical.

One discouraging element in our results, however, is that only 40 percent of the public two-year colleges in this country have the curricular offerings and admissions policies expected of public community colleges. Again, although almost all public two-year colleges state that they have an open admissions policy, almost 45 percent of these institutions require more than a high school diploma (or its equivalent) or some minimum age standard for admission.

Unfortunately, our methodology does not allow us to comment as to the effectiveness of current compensatory education programs and practices in either public or private two-year colleges. However, in reviewing the analysis of data summarizing the extent of programs and services, it does appear that public two-year colleges need additional emphasis on recruitment teams from the college to go into the ghettos. They also need to devote more resources in training faculty for dealing with minority group academically disadvantaged students. Finally, it would seem that since only 17 percent of the public two-year colleges have developed special courses in ethnic studies, more is needed in this area, particularly in view of the relationship of pride in one's self (one's culture) to academic achievement.

It is interesting to note that although one-fifth of the private two-year colleges had special programs for the academically disadvantaged, two-thirds of these schools indicated that they had developed special courses for the academically disadvantaged. Although we cannot expect private institutions to be as concerned with the academically disadvantaged as public institutions, it is reasonable to expect that they should evidence some concern for the problems of the minority group academically disadvantaged. From the data presented above, one may conclude that many are evidencing that concern.

It is both disappointing and encouraging that approximately 40 percent of the public two-year colleges indicate that they have special programs for the academically disadvantaged. It is encouraging because the percentage of public two-year colleges having such programs has increased dramatically in the last ten years; it is disappointing in that only 40 percent of the public two-year colleges have these programs. Indeed, the development of innovative pedagogical techniques and programs for the academically disadvantaged is supposedly a mark of distinction for the two-year college in American higher education. It is in the development of such programs that the public two-year college can fulfill a vitally needed function—that of extending the opportunity for upward mobility to many of those who

feel "shut out" of any chance to "make it" in this society through legitimate channels. It is through the development of an effective and innovative compensatory education program, effective not only in assisting students in their development once they are in the institution, but also in drawing such students into the college, that the two-year college can assist in the maintenance of social stability in this society. Indeed, if public two-year colleges in this country are to adequately fulfill their mission, much more effort must go into assisting these schools in widening their doors and in developing programs of remedial education.

TABLE 1

Sample Stratification Cells and Weights for Public and Private Two-Year Colleges

| Cell Definition[a] | Population (1970) | Number Used In ACE Norms | Sample Response to Current Study | Cell Weights[b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Public | | | | |
| Enrollment less than 500 | 408 | 6 | 6 | 68 |
| Enrollment 500-999 | 209 | 5 | 5 | 42 |
| Enrollment 1000 or more | 169 | 17 | 14 | 12 |
| Private | | | | |
| Enrollment less than 100 | 61 | 3 | 3 | 20 |
| Enrollment 100-245 | 102 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Enrollment 250 or more | 69 | 12 | 11 | 6 |

[a]Enrollment figures are based on the total number of first-time, full-time entrants.

[b]This weight is the ratio between the number of institutions in the population within the stratification cells and the number of institutions in the sample corresponding to those cells.

TABLE 2

Stated Open Admissions for In-District, Out-of-District, and Out-of-State Students in Two-Year Colleges

| Public Two-Year Colleges Having Stated Open Admissions For | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent | Weighted N | Percent | Weighted N |
| In-District Students | 99 | 774 | 15 | 34 |
| Out-of-District Students | 89 | 696 | 10 | 22 |
| Out-of-State Students | 80 | 628 | 10 | 22 |

TABLE 3

Admissions Criteria for Two-Year Colleges

| Admissions Criteria | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent | Weighted N | Percent | Weighted N |
| High School Diploma or Equivalent | 86 | 696 | 97 | 220 |
| Minimum Age | 27 | 214 | 0 | 0 |
| High School Grade Average | 0 | 0 | 34 | 76 |
| Test Scores | 28 | 218 | 82 | 186 |
| Interview | 7 | 54 | 41 | 92 |
| Letter of Recommendation | 16 | 122 | 81 | 182 |
| Physical Examination | 41 | 322 | 95 | 214 |
| Require high school diploma or certificate only | 34 | 264 | 3 | 6 |
| Require minimum age only | 5 | 42 | 0 | 0 |
| Require only high school diploma or minimum age | 55 | 434 | 3 | 6 |

TABLE 4

Counseling Services at Two-Year Colleges

| Counseling Services | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent | Weighted N | Percent | Weighted N |
| Personal Counseling | 99 | 774 | 86 | 200 |
| Academic Counseling | 99 | 774 | 100 | 226 |
| Vocational-Occupational Counseling | 99 | 774 | 61 | 138 |
| Job Placement Counseling | 95 | 750 | 44 | 100 |
| Job Placement Follow-Up Counseling | 72 | 562 | 10 | 22 |

TABLE 5

Curricular Offerings in Two-Year Colleges

| Curricular Offerings | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent | Weighted N | Percent | Weighted N |
| Academic (Transfer or Preprofessional) | 100 | 786 | 93 | 210 |
| Occupational (Associate Degree) | 100 | 786 | 70 | 158 |
| Occupational (Certificate) | 76 | 598 | 14 | 32 |
| Continuing Education (Adult, Special Interest Courses) | 69 | 542 | 9 | 20 |
| Developmental, Preparatory, or Remedial | 46 | 358 | 7 | 16 |
| Only Academic and Occupational Associate Programs | 14 | 110 | 49 | 110 |
| All Programs but Developmental | 26 | 202 | 9 | 20 |
| All Programs | 39 | 304 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 6

Percentage of Public and Nonpublic Two-Year Colleges With Special Programs, Courses or Services for the Academically Disadvantaged

| | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N |
| Special Programs | 39 | 290 | 24 | 48 |
| Special Courses | 99 | 774 | 59 | 112 |
| Special Services | 100 | 774 | 66 | 134 |
| Have Special Programs, Courses, and Services | 37 | 290 | 19 | 42 |

TABLE 7

Special Recruitment Services for the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges*

| Services | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N |
| Recruitment Teams | 36 | 266 | 28 | 26 |
| Use of Community Contracts | 75 | 464 | 12 | 10 |

*For private two-year colleges, only those institutions reporting special programs, courses, or services for the academically disadvantaged are included in this table. Since all public two-year colleges reported that they had special programs, courses, or services for the academically disadvantaged, the statistics provided may be generalized to all public two-year colleges in the country.

TABLE 8

Special Guidance and Counseling for the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges*

| Services | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N |
| Special Guidance and Counseling | 89 | 554 | 88 | 118 |
| Special Tutoring | 91 | 664 | 76 | 100 |
| Use of Regular Faculty in Tutoring | 95 | 440 | 89 | 80 |
| Use of Specially Trained Faculty in Tutoring | 56 | 134 | 67 | 40 |
| Use of Regular Students for Tutoring | 77 | 272 | 100 | 76 |
| Use of Advanced Students in Program for Tutoring | 65 | 212 | 80 | 40 |

*For private two-year colleges, only those institutions reporting that they had special programs, courses, or services for the academically disadvantaged are included in this table. Since all public two-year colleges reported that they had special programs, courses or services for the academically disadvantaged, the statistics provided may be generalized to all public two-year colleges in the country.

TABLE 9

Instructional Services for the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges*

| Instructional Services | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N |
| Use of Programmed Instruction | 72 | 482 | 67 | 62 |
| Use of Reduced Course Loads | 86 | 640 | 72 | 104 |
| Liberalized Probationary or Readmission Practices | 58 | 388 | 46 | 48 |
| Attention to Development of Study Skills | 89 | 628 | 93 | 134 |
| Stress Communication Skills | 100 | 774 | 92 | 114 |
| Stress Reading Skills | 100 | 732 | 100 | 84 |
| Stress Writing Skills | 91 | 652 | 94 | 88 |
| Stress Speaking Skills | 77 | 452 | 78 | 56 |
| Stress Listening Skills | 83 | 544 | 38 | 22 |
| Stress the Utilization of Traditional English | 58 | 358 | 62 | 32 |
| Stress Understanding of Student's Own Dialect | 52 | 352 | 45 | 46 |
| Develop Special Courses in Ethnic Studies | 17 | 102 | 16 | 16 |

*For private two-year colleges, only those institutions reporting that they had special programs, courses or services for the academically disadvantaged are included in this table. Since all public two-year colleges reported that they had special programs, courses or services for the academically disadvantaged the statistics provided may be generalized to all public two-year colleges in the country.

TABLE 10

Nature and Extent of Federally Funded Financial Aid to Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges*

| Type of Federal Aid | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N |
| Federal Scholarships | 39 | 304 | 39 | 58 |
| Federal Guaranteed Loan | 66 | 520 | 48 | 72 |
| Federal Work-Study | 79 | 622 | 61 | 92 |
| Federal Co-op | 10 | 80 | 7 | 10 |
| Other Federal Aid | 17 | 134 | 27 | 40 |
| No Federal Aid | 5 | 42 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 11

Nature and Extent of State Funded Financial Aid to Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges*

| Type of State Aid | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N |
| State Scholarships | 61 | 480 | 17 | 26 |
| State Guaranteed Loan | 29 | 224 | 7 | 10 |
| State Work-Study | 42 | 328 | 7 | 10 |
| State Co-op | 2 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| Other State Aid | 3 | 24 | 0 | 0 |
| No State Aid | 16 | 122 | 13 | 20 |

*For private two-year colleges, only those institutions reporting that they had special programs, courses or services for the academically disadvantaged are included in this table. Since all public two-year colleges reported that they had special programs, courses or services for the academically disadvantaged, the statistics provided may be generalized to all public two-year colleges in the country.

TABLE 12

Nature and Extent of Institutional Financial Aid to the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges*

| Type of Institutional Aid | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N |
| Institutional Scholarships | 63 | 494 | 51 | 76 |
| Institutional Guaranteed Loan | 21 | 164 | 17 | 26 |
| Institutional Work-Study | 39 | 304 | 45 | 68 |
| Institutional Co-op | 5 | 36 | 20 | 30 |
| Other Institutional Aid | 5 | 36 | 13 | 20 |
| No Institutional Aid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 13

Nature and Extent of Privately Funded Aid to the Minority Group Academically Disadvantaged in Two-Year Colleges*

| Type of Private Aid | Public | | Nonpublic | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N | Percent Affirmative | Weighted N |
| Private Scholarship | 52 | 406 | 44 | 66 |
| Private Guaranteed Loan | 16 | 122 | 13 | 20 |
| Private Work-Study | 10 | 80 | 27 | 40 |
| Private Co-op | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 |
| Other Private Aid | 10 | 80 | 0 | 0 |
| No Private Aid | 9 | 68 | 0 | 0 |

*For private two-year colleges, only those institutions reporting that they had special programs, courses or services for the academically disadvantaged are included in this table. Since all public two-year colleges reported that they had special programs, courses or services for the academically disadvantaged, the statistics provided may be generalized to all public two-year colleges in the country.

# APPENDIX A

## LIST OF COLLEGES IN THE SAMPLE

John E. Rouse, Pres.
Anderson College
Anderson, South Carolina

Douglas D. Perkins, Pres.
Bay Path Junior College
Longmeadow, Massachusetts

Sidney Silverman, Pres.
Bergen Community College
Paramus, New Jersey

Robert A. Davis, Pres.
Brevard College
Brevard, North Carolina

Rhea M. Eckel, Pres.
Cazenovia College
Cazenovia, New York

Chester H. Gausman, Pres.
Central Nebraska Technical College
Hastings, Nebraska

Bruce E. Whitaker, Pres.
Chowan College
Murfreesboro, North Carolina

Ivan Crookshanks, Supt. Pres.
College of the Sequoias
Visalia, California

Kurt R. Schmeller, Pres.
CUNY-Queensborough College
Bayside, New York

Sr. Mary Lourdes Michel, Pres.
Cullman College
Cullman, Alabama

Sr. M. R. Pendergast, Pres. Dean
Donnelly College
Kansas City, Kansas

W. Floyd Scott, Dean
Eastern Iowa Community College
Muscatine Campus
Muscatine, Iowa

William Edward Leads, Pres.
Forest Park Community College
St. Louis, Missouri

H. A. Gardner, Pres.
Freed Hardeman College
Henderson, Tennessee

Cruce Stark, Pres.
Grayson County Junior College
Denison, Texas

Herman A. Heise, Pres.
Indian River Junior College
Fort Pierce, Florida

Harold E. Wilson, Pres.
Itasca State Junior College
Grand Rapids, Minnesota

Harry K. Miller, Jr., Pres.
Keystone Junior College
LaPlume, Pennsylvania

W. Lamar Fly, Pres.
Kishwaukee College
Malta, Illinois

Wayne Rodehorst, Pres.
Lakeland Community College
Mentor, Ohio

Glenn G. Gooder, Pres.
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles, California

Samuel R. Neel, Jr., Pres.
Manatee Junior College
Bradenton, Florida

Leslie Koltai, Pres.
Metropolitan Junior College
Kansas City, Missouri

Albert N. Cox, Pres.
Midway Junior College
Midway, Kentucky

*These colleges did not respond to the questionnaire.

L. A. Foster, Pres.
Missouri Baptist College
Hannibal, Missouri

P. A. Edwards, Dean
Morristown College
Morristown, Tennessee

W. Burkette Raper, Pres.
Mount Olive Junior College
Mount Olive, North Carolina

Ernest Notar, Pres.
Niagara County Community College
Niagara Falls, New York

J. Louis Stokes, Pres.
Utica Junior College
Utica, Mississippi

J. D. Moore, Pres.
Victoria College
Victoria, Texas

Sr. Mary Pachomia, Pres.
Villa Maria College of Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

Edward L. Fleckenstein, Pres.
VoorheesTechnical Institute
New York, New York

Theodore Nicksick, Jr., Pres.
Wharton County Junior College
Wharton, Texas

*Budd E. Smith, Pres.
Wingate College
Wingate, North Carolina

Clifton W. Emery, Jr., Pres.
Worcester Junior College
Worcester, Massachusetts

W. Donald Olsen, Pres.
Worthington State Junior College
Worthington, Minnesota

D. Walker
Yuba College
Marysville, California

Sinclair Orendorff, Pres.
Northwest Community College
Powell, Wyoming

Frederic B. Viaux, Pres.
Garland Junior College
Boston, Massachusetts

T. L. Neely, Pres.
North Greenville Junior College
Tigerville, South Carolina

Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Pres.
Northampton County Area Community College
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

John J. Skillman, Jr., Pres.
Packer Collegiate Institute,
Junior College of the
Brooklyn, New York

Frederick C. Ferry, Jr., Pres.
Pine Manor Junior College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

*Paul G. Preus, Pres.
Quinsigamond Community College
Worcester, Massachusetts

J. R. Burgess, Jr., Pres.
Reinhardt College
Waleska, Georgia

Andrew Junkin, Pres.
Schreiner Institute
Kerrville, Texas

Marvin C. Knudson, Pres.
Sinclair Community College
Dayton, Ohio

Sr. M. Borgia Fehlig, Pres.
Springfield College
Springfield, Illinois

*W. R. Kunsela, President
SUNY Agricultural and Tech. College
Delhi, New York

Ralph J. Jalkanen, Pres.
Suomi College
Hancock, Michigan

T. A. Lawson, Pres.
Theodore A. Lawson State
Junior College
Birmingham, Alabama

University of Maine
Augusta, Maine

University of Missouri
St. Louis, Missouri

## APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE

*SURVEY OF TWO-YEAR PROGRAMS FOR THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED*

## PART I. BASIC INFORMATION

Please indicate your response by circling the appropriate number.

| 1. Does your institution have an open admissions policy? | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| a. for in-district students | 1 | 2 |
| b. for out-of-district students | 1 | 2 |
| c. for out-of-state students | 1 | 2 |

| 2. Which of the following are required for admission to your institution? (Please circle all that apply) | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. High school diploma or equivalent | 1 | 2 |
| b. Minimum age ( _____ ) | 1 | 2 |
| c. High School grade average ( _____ ) | 1 | 2 |
| d. Test Scores | 1 | 2 |
| e. Interview | 1 | 2 |
| f. Letter or recommendation | 1 | 2 |
| g. Physical examination | 1 | 2 |
| h. Other (please specify) ( _____ ) | 1 | 2 |

| 3. Does your institution have any of the following counseling services? | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. Personal | 1 | 2 |
| b. Academic | 1 | 2 |
| c. Vocational-occupational | 1 | 2 |
| d. Job placement | 1 | 2 |
| e. Job placement follow-up | 1 | 2 |

Please answer questions 4 through 9 either from your records or from your general knowledge. Please enter "0" if the answer is none. (It is not necessary to make a special survey for this study.) Indicate the accuracy of your answer by circling one of the following:

A -- VERY ACCURATE
B -- REASONABLY ACCURATE
C -- ROUGH ESTIMATE

| | Accuracy Estimate |
|---|---|
| 4. In the Fall of 1970, how many students (full-time and part-time) were enrolled in your institution? | _____ A B C |
| Of this number, what percent were enrolled in the following curriculum programs: | |
| a. Academic (transfer or preprofessional) | ____% A B C |
| b. Occupational (associate degree) | ____% A B C |
| c. Occupational (certificate) | ____% A B C |
| d. Continuing Education (Adult, special interest courses) | ____% A B C |
| e. Developmental, Preparatory, or Remedial | ____% A B C |

5. During the 1969-70 academic year in the TRANSFER program, what percent of your students (full-time and part-time)

Accuracy Estimate

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. transferred to another college | ____% | A B C |
| b. transferred to the OCCUPATIONAL curriculum | ____% | A B C |
| c. withdrew for employment related to their schooling | ____% | A B C |
| d. withdrew for employment not related to their schooling | ____% | A B C |
| e. withdrew because of academic failure | ____% | A B C |
| f. withdrew for other reasons | ____% | A B C |

If your institution has no OCCUPATIONAL program, please skip to question 7.

6. During the 1969-70 academic year in the OCCUPATIONAL program (degree and certificate), what percent of your students (full-time and part-time)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. transferred to another college | ____% | A B C |
| b. transferred to the TRANSFER program | ____% | A B C |
| c. withdrew for employment related to their schooling | ____% | A B C |
| d. withdrew for employment not related to their schooling | ____% | A B C |
| e. withdrew because of academic failure | ____% | A B C |
| f. withdrew for other reasons | ____% | A B C |

7. In the Fall of 1970, how many MINORITY GROUP* students (full-time and part-time) were enrolled in your institution? _____ A B C

If your institution has less than 10 minority group students, please skip to question 10.

Of the MINORITY GROUP students enrolled, what percent were enrolled in the following curricular programs?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. Academic (transfer or preprofessional) | ____% | A B C |
| b. Occupational (associate degree) | ____% | A B C |
| c. Occupational (certificate) | ____% | A B C |
| d. Continuing Education (Adult, special interest courses) | ____% | A B C |
| e. Developmental, Preparatory, or Remedial | ____% | A B C |

8. During the 1969-70 academic year in the TRANSFER program, what percent of your MINORITY GROUP students (full-time and part-time)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. transferred to another college | ____% | A B C |
| b. transferred to the OCCUPATIONAL curriculum | ____% | A B C |
| c. withdrew for employment related to their schooling | ____% | A B C |
| d. withdrew for employment not related to their schooling | ____% | A B C |
| e. withdrew because of academic failure | ____% | A B C |
| f. withdrew for other reasons | ____% | A B C |

If your institution has no OCCUPATIONAL program, please skip to question 10.

*Those students who have Spanish surnames, are Black or American Indian

9. During the 1969-70 academic year in the OCCUPATIONAL program (degree and certificate), what percent of your MINORITY GROUP students (full-time and part-time)

| | Accuracy Estimate |
|---|---|
| a. transferred to another college | ____% A B C |
| b. transferred to the TRANSFER program | ____% A B C |
| c. withdrew for employment related to their schooling | ____% A B C |
| d. withdrew for employment not related to their schooling | ____% A B C |
| e. withdrew because of academic failure | ____% A B C |
| f. withdrew for other reasons | ____% A B C |

10. Is there a post-secondary technical-vocational school within one hour travel time of your instititution? YES 1 NO 2

11. Please estimate the percentage of your student body who predominately use the following means of transportation to arrive at your institution:

| | |
|---|---|
| a. walk | ____% |
| b. public transportation | ____% |
| c. privately owned vehicle | ____% |

## PART II. SPECIAL PROGRAMS, COURSES, OR SERVICES FOR THE ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

The following questions relate to special programs, courses, or services which some institutions have developed as a consequence of recent national attention on the academically disadvantaged, i.e., on those students who do not normally qualify for degree programs.

| | No. of Minority Group Students | No. of Other Students |
|---|---|---|
| 1. APPROXIMATELY how many such students are enrolled at your institution? (If none, please so indicate) | _____ | _____ |

2. Has your institution:

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| a. developed a special program for the academically disadvantaged? | 1 | 2 |
| b. developed courses which could be classified as remedial or developmental? | 1 | 2 |
| c. developed special services e.g., tutoring, counseling, financial aid for those who are academically disadvantaged? | 1 | 2 |

If the responses to all questions in item two (2) above were NO, please fold this questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided. If not, please continue.

| | | No. of Minority Group Students | No. of Other Students |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. APPROXIMATELY how many students have you enrolled in a Special Program for the academically disadvantaged? (A program which is distinct from the regular college program.) | Fall, '69 | _____ | _____ |
| | Fall, '70 | _____ | _____ |

| 4. APPROXIMATELY how many students who are enrolled in the regular program are enrolled in developmental or remedial courses in addition to the regular programs? (Please do not include those in 3.) | No. of Minority Group Students | No. of Other Students |
|---|---|---|
| | _____ | _____ |

(If your institution had no special program in the 1969-70 academic year, please skip to question 6.)

| 5. Please ESTIMATE the number of students in the special program for the academically disadvantaged in the 1969-70 academic year who: | | |
|---|---|---|
| a. dropped out of school | _____ | _____ |
| b. transferred into: | | |
| Transfer program | _____ | _____ |
| Occupational: degree program | _____ | _____ |
| Occupational: certificate program | _____ | _____ |
| Continuing education program | _____ | _____ |

| 6. Which of the following items are included in programs and/or services for the MINORITY GROUP academically disadvantaged? | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| a. Recruitment teams | 1 | 2 |
| b. List of community contacts for "leads" to minority group students | 1 | 2 |
| c. Lower admissions requirements | 1 | 2 |
| d. Extra counseling and guidance | 1 | 2 |
| e. Special tutoring | 1 | 2 |
| (if YES, please identify the kinds of persons utilized as tutors) | | |
| Regular faculty | 1 | 2 |
| Special faculty | 1 | 2 |
| Regular Students | 1 | 2 |
| Advanced students in the program | 1 | 2 |
| f. Programmed instruction | 1 | 2 |
| g. Reduced course loads | 1 | 2 |
| h. Liberalized probationary or readmission practices | 1 | 2 |
| i. Instruction in development of study skills | 1 | 2 |
| j. Special course in particular ethnic studies | 1 | 2 |
| k. Stress on communication skills | 1 | 2 |
| (If YES, please indicate particular areas) | | |
| Reading | 1 | 2 |
| Writing | 1 | 2 |
| Speaking | 1 | 2 |
| Listening | 1 | 2 |
| Utilization of traditional English | 1 | 2 |
| Understanding of student's own dialect as a language system | 1 | 2 |

1. Financial aid
   (Please indicate sources and type of aid by circling as many as apply below)

| | Type of Aid | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Source | Scholarship | Guaranteed Loan | Work Study | Co-op | Other | None |
| Federal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| State | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Institutional | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Private | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

7. What (in your opinion) are the THREE MAJOR REASONS for attrition of MINORITY GROUP Students?

(Circle three reasons only.)

a. Inadequate motivation
b. Inadequate academic ability
c. Lack of parental support
d. Disciplinary problems
e. Inadequate institutional support of students
f. Inadequate qualified administrative staff
g. Lack of qualified faculty
h. Inadequate finances (student)
i. Inadequate finances (institution)
j. Inadequate emotional stability or immaturity
k. Lack of supportive peer relationships

8. Do you have any special instructional or training programs to assist your faculty to work with academically deficient students?

| YES | NO |
|---|---|
| 1 | 2 |

---

Name of individual completing this questionnaire:

_____

Title: _____

Phone number: _____

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Beck, John M., and Saxe, Richard W. *Teaching the Disadvantaged Pupil.* Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.

Capper, Michael R. "Junior College Students on Academic Probation." *ERIC Junior College Research Review* 4 (1969): 1-3.

Clark, Burton. "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education." *The American Journal of Sociology* 65 (1960): 569-76.

Clark, Kenneth B. "The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges." *ERIC Report Resumes,* New York: ERIC, 1963.

Creager, John A. "General Purpose Sampling in the Domain of Higher Education." *ACE Research Reports,* Vol. 3, no. 2, Washington: American Council on Education, 1968a.

_____ "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen 1969." *ACE Research Reports,* Vol. 4, no. 7, Washington: American Council on Education, 1969

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Institutions of Higher Education Programs." *USOE Application Information and Program Manual,* OE Form 1215, no. 3 (1970).

Deutsch, Martin; Katz, Irwin, and Janse, Arthur R. *Social Class, Race, and Psychological Development.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Dey, Charles F., and Jackson, Davis. *A Better Chance: An Educational Program Sponsored by Dartmouth College.* Hanover, New Hampshire: Dartmouth College, 1965.

Egerton, John. *Higher Education for High Risk Students.* Atlanta: Southern Education Reporting Service, 1968.

Elsner, Paul A. *The Peralta College's Inner-City Project: A Demonstration Project.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970

Ferrante, Joan. *The Negro American: A Reading List for Elementary Teachers.* Glassboro, New Jersey: Educational Improvement Center, 1969.

Gleazer, Edmund J. "Programs for the Disadvantaged, A Policy Statement of the AAJC." *Junior College Journal* 40 (1969): 3-4.

Gordon, Edmund W. "Higher Education and the Disadvantaged." *IRCD Bulletin* 5 (1969): 1-2; 10-11.

Gordon, Edmund W., and Wilkerson, Doxey A. *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged; Programs and Practices: Preschool Through College.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Johnson, B. Lamar. *Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College.* Beverly Hills, California: Glencoe Press, 1969.

Kendrick, S. A. and Thomas, Charles L. "Transition from School to College." *Review of Educational Research* 40 (1970): 151-79.

Knoell, Dorothy M. "Outreach to the Disadvantaged." *Community College Programs for People Who Need College.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

Koester, Susan. "Chicago City College: A Center for Innovation." *Community College Programs for People Who Need College.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

Landrith, Harold F. *Introduction to the Community Junior College.* Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers & Publishers, 1971.

Lombardi, John. "Black Studies." *ERIC Junior College Research Review,* 4 (1970) : 6-9.

_____ "Black Studies in the Community College." *ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, AAJC,* No. 13 (1971).

Lopata, Carol. *The College Readiness Program: A Program for Third World Students at the College of San Matao, California.* New York: ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged. Teachers College—Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute, 1968.

Love, Theresa R. "Needs and Approaches for Developing Linguistic Abilities." *Journal of Negro Education* 35 (1966) : 400-408.

McGrath, Earl J. *Universal Higher Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Medsker, Leland I. and Tillery, Dale. *Breaking the Access Barriers—A Profile of Two-Year Colleges.* New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1971.

Meek, Doris A. "Black Power and the Instructional Council." *Community College Programs for People Who Need College.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

Miller, Carroll L. "Issues and Problems in the Higher Education of Negro Americans." *Journal of Negro Education* 35 (1966) : 485-493.

National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. *Progress Report.* Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

President's Commission on Higher Education. *Higher Education for American Democracy: Establishing the Goals.* Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

Shaffer, Michael I.; Boddy, Edward, and Bridges, Winston T., Jr. *Implementing the Open Door: Compensatory Education in Florida's Community Colleges.* Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Community-Junior College Inter-Institutional Research Council, 1970.

Stokes, Carl B. *Social Action and the Community College.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

Strauss, William A. *From Upward Bound to the Junior College—The Focus Way.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

Turner, Ralph. "Sponsored and Contest Mobility and the School System." *The American Sociological Review* 25 (1960):855-67.

Wilkinson, Rachel D. "Discovery in the Bronx." *Community College Programs for People Who Need College.* Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

Williams, Robert L. *What Are We Learning From Current University Programs for Disadvantaged Students?* Knoxville: Tennessee University, 1968.

_____ "What Are We Learning From Current Programs for the Disadvantaged?" *Journal of Higher Education* 40 (1969):274-85.

## Notes on the Authors

JAMES L. MORRISON currently holds the position of Assistant Professor of Education and Sociology at The Pennsylvania State University. He received a Ph.D. in the Sociology of Higher Education from the Florida State University in 1969. His publication and research interests deal with attitudes of community college faculty, professional education, and education for the disadvantaged. Beginning fall 1973 he will be Associate Professor of Higher Education at the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill).

REYNOLDS FERRANTE serves as a management consultant to the Center for Cooperative Research with Schools of The Pennsylvania State University. Mr. Ferrante has also served and continues to serve in this capacity to state and federal projects sponsored by HEW. Currently he is consultant to the Alabama State Department of Education in their development of a Management Information System and to a seven-state cooperative accountability project operating in Denver, Colorado. Mr. Ferrante is completing his D.Ed. in higher education.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The Center for the Study of Higher Education was established in January 1969 to study higher education as an area of scholarly inquiry and research. Dr. G. Lester Anderson, its director, is aided by a staff of twenty, including five full-time researchers, and a cadre of advanced graduate students and supporting staff.

The Center's studies are designed to be relevant not only to the University and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but also to colleges and universities throughout the nation. The immediate focus of the Center's research falls into the broad areas of governance, graduate and professional education, and occupation programs in two-year colleges.

Research reports, monographs, and position papers prepared by staff members of the Center can be obtained on a limited basis. Inquiries should be addressed to the **Center for the Study of Higher Education, 101 Rackley Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 16802.**

## SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

### Monographs

*Human Services Occupations in the Two-Year College: A Handbook,* Theodore E. Kiffer and Martha Burns, May 1972.

*Pennsylvania Community College Faculty: Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations,* John W. Moore, and *Career Patterns and Educational Issues,* Robert A. Patterson, May 1971.

*Institutional Self-Study at The Pennsylvania State University,* Kenneth P. Mortimer and David W. Leslie (eds.), December 1971.

### Numbered Reports

*Pennsylvania's "State-Owned" Institutions: Some Dimensions of Degree Output,* William Toombs and Stephen D. Millman, February 1973, Report No. 20.

*The Trend Toward Government Financing of Higher Education Through Students: Can the Market Model be Applied?,* Larry L. Leslie, January 1973, Report No. 19.

*The Rationale for Various Plans for Funding American Higher Education,* Larry L. Leslie, June 1972, Report No. 18.

*Collective Bargaining: Implications for Governance,* G. Gregory Lozier, and Kenneth P. Mortimer, July 1972, Report No. 17.

*Productivity and the Academy: The Current Condition,* William Toombs, May 1972, Report No. 16.

*Exceptional Graduate Admissions at The Pennsylvania State Univeristy,* Manuel G. Gunne and Larry L. Leslie, March 1972, Report No. 15.

*The Quality of Graduate Studies: Pennsylvania and Selected States,* Stephen D. Millman and William Toombs, February 1972, Report No. 14.

*Goals and Ambivalance: Faculty Values and The Community College Philosophy,* Karen L. Bloom, Angelo C. Gillie, and Larry L. Leslie, November 1971, Report No. 13.

*Governance and Emerging Values in Higher Education,* Kenneth P. Mortimer, Stanley O. Ikenberry, and G. Lester Anderson, September 1971, Report No. 12.

*The Academic Senate at The Pennsylvania State University,* Kenneth P. Mortimer and David W. Leslie, August 1971, Report No. 11.

*Professional Education: Some Perspectives, 1971,* Larry L. Leslie, Kenneth P. Mortimer and G. Lester Anderson, August 1971, Report No. 10.

*Centers and Institutes at The Pennsylvania State University: A Case Study*, Mary M. Norman, March 1971, Report No. 9.

*New Careers in Human Services: A Challenge to the Two-Year College* (A Preliminary Report), Martha A. Burns, March 1971, Report No. 8.

*The Academy and General Education*, Stanley O. Ikenberry, December 1970, Report No. 7.

*A Profile of Proliferating Institutes: A Study of Selected Characteristics of Institutes and Centers in 51 Land-Grant Universities*, Stanley O. Ikenberry, November 1970, Report No. 6.

*Roles and Structures for Participation in Higher Education Governance: A Rationale*, Stanley O. Ikenberry, August 1970, Report No. 5.

*Higher Education and the Black Atypical Student*, W. Frank Hull, IV, February 1970, Report No. 4.

*Colloquy: A Student-Initiated Reform in Higher Education*, W. Frank Hull, IV, February 1970, Report No. 3.

*The Changing College Curriculum—Issues and Implications*, G. Lester Anderson, and *Instructional Systems in Higher Education—Specifications for Individualization*, Stanley O. Ikenberry, January 1970, Report No. 2.

*The "Special Admission" Student and the College*, W. Frank Hull, IV, November 1969, Report No. 1.

**Conference Reports**

*The Third Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Post-Secondary Occupational Education*, Angelo C. Gillie, June 1972.

*The Second Annual Pennsylvania Conference on Post-Secondary Occupational Education*, Angelo C. Gillie, June 1971.

*Post-Secondary Occupational Education: An Overview and Strategies*, Angelo C. Gillie, January 1970.

**Bibliographies**

*Selected Bibliography in Higher Education*, September 1969, Revised April 1971.

*Student Unrest on the American Campus*, David Leslie, November 1969.

*The Black Student in Higher Education*, W. Frank Hull, IV, November 1969.

*Selected Bibliography on the Concept of Leadership*, Robert Smedley, June 1970.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**Occasional Papers**

Naomi V. Ross, *Community College Teacher Preparation Programs in the U.S.: A Bibliography with Introductory Notes*, August 1972.

Harold Richard, *Some Considerations Involved in Changing the Male/Female Ratio at University Park*, June 1970.

G. Lester Anderson, K. Mortimer, W. Frank Hull, IV, David Leslie, *Academic Senates: Some Models with Background Material*, March 1970.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 27 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION